



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/163,977	09/30/1998	JU-HA PARK	Q51897	6115
21171	7590	05/19/2004	EXAMINER	
STAAS & HALSEY LLP SUITE 700 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005			TRAN, TRANG U	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2614	

DATE MAILED: 05/19/2004

36

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

09/163,977

**Applicant(s)**

PARK, JU-HA

**Examiner**

Trang U. Tran

**Art Unit**

2614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 March 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 and 30-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 30-36 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Arguments*

1. Applicant's arguments filed March 05, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In re page 11, applicant argues that claim 1 defines over the reference to Kim and the rejection is believed to be overcome because Kim discloses an automatic sequential check of EPG information the "other channels" and Kim lacks the advantage of already having acquired EPG information of the preferential channel as claimed.

In response, the examiner respectfully disagrees. Kim et al discloses in col. 4, lines 39-41 that **"Also, it is possible that, when needed, only the channels desired by the user are checked for EPG information to be updated"**. From the above passage, it is clear that Kim et al does indeed discloses the claimed acquired EPQ information of the preferential channels as claimed.

In re pages 11-12, applicant argues that, with respect to claim 3, no combination of the references teaches or suggests the currently tuned in channel, the preferential channel, and the remaining accessible channels of the claimed invention because Cuccia fails to disclose "acquiring program guide information of accessible channels including a channel currently tuned into and remaining channels and Kim fails to disclose each of "the currently tuned in channel, the preferential channel, and the remaining accessible channels".

In response, the examiner respectfully disagrees. Kim et al discloses in col. 2, lines 55-65 that **"A first transport stream (TS) decoder 106 separates audio data,**

Art Unit: 2614

video data, and auxiliary data ... Besides, the auxiliary data containing the EPG information are delivered to the microprocessor 116" and in col. 3, lines 29-37 that "FIG. 2 is a process flow chart of the microprocessor 116 illustrating that the current viewing channel is selected by the first tuner 100, and the second tuner 108 automatically searches all the channels, thereby identifying EPG information about each channel from auxiliary data separated by the second TS decoder 114, and updating EPG information so as to store the updated EPG information in the memory 118". From the above passages, it is clear that Kim et al discloses the claimed "the currently tuned in channel and the remaining accessible channels" and, as discussed above, Kim et al discloses the claimed "the preferential channel" in col. 4, lines 39-41. Thus, Kim et al does disclose the claimed "the currently tuned in channel, the preferential channel, and the remaining accessible channels" as claimed.

In re page 12, applicant states that claims 5 and 7-10 are dependent on claim 3 and are therefore believed to be allowable for at least the reasons as set forth above with respect to the allowability of claim 3.

In response, as discussed above, Kim et al discloses all the claimed limitations of claim 3.

In re pages 12-13, applicant argues that, with respect to claim 6, Cuccia simply could not anticipate "searching for accessible channels to obtain program guide information being broadcast by controlling said tuner in a background operation while a user refers to the program list".

In response, the examiner respectfully disagrees. Cuccia discloses in col. 5, lines 3-8 that **"The TV-set could be further adapted to update the EPG while the user is zapping through various TV-stations. In this case, the tuner 103 is not used for scanning the stations autonomously, but in fact the scanning behaviour of the user is utilized to collect the EPG information"**. From the above passage, it is clear that Cuccia teaches the claimed "searching for accessible channels to obtain program guide information being broadcast by controlling said tuner in a background operation while a user refers to the program list (zapping through various TV-stations)".

Additionally, Kim et al also discloses the claimed "searching for accessible channels to obtain program guide information being broadcast by controlling said tuner in a background operation while a user refers to the program list" in col. 4, lines 39-41 as discussed above with respect to claim 1.

In re page 13, applicant argues, with respect to claim 12, that claim 12 is allowable for at least the reasons as set forth with respect to the allowability of claim 6 because claim 12 includes subject matter that is substantially similar to the subject matter of claim 6.

In response, as discussed above with respect to claim 6, Cuccia and Kim et al disclose all the claimed limitations of claim 6.

In re page 13, applicant states that claims 13-16 are dependent on claim 12 and are therefore believed to be allowable for at least the reasons as set forth above with respect to the allowable of claim 12.

Art Unit: 2614

In response, as discussed above with respect to claims 6 and 12, Cuccia and Kim et al disclose all the claimed limitations of claims 6 and 12.

In re page 13, applicant argues, with respect to claim 19, that claim 19 is allowable for at least the reasons as set forth with respect to the allowability of claims 6 and 12 because claim 19 includes subject matter that is substantially similar to the subject matter of claims 6 and 12.

In response, as discussed above with respect to claims 6 and 12, Cuccia and Kim et al disclose all the claimed limitations of claims 6 and 12.

In re page 13, applicant states that claims 20-23 are dependent on claim 19 and are therefore believed to be allowable for at least the reasons as set forth above with respect to the allowable of claim 19.

In response, as discussed above with respect to claims 6, 12, and 19, Cuccia and Kim et al disclose all the claimed limitations of claims 6, 12, and 19.

In re page 14, applicant states that claim 27 is dependent on claim 1 and is therefore believed to be allowable for at least the reasons as set forth above with respect to the allowable of claim 1.

In response, as discussed above with respect to claim 1, Kim et al disclose all the claimed limitations of claim 1.

In re page 14, applicant states that claim 26 is dependent on claim 1 and is therefore believed to be allowable for at least the reasons as set forth above with respect to the allowable of claim 1.

Art Unit: 2614

In response, as discussed above with respect to claim 1, Kim et al disclose all the claimed limitations of claim 1.

In re page 14, applicant states that claim 4 is dependent on claim 3 and is therefore believed to be allowable for at least the reasons as set forth above with respect to the allowable of claim 3.

In response, as discussed above with respect to claim 3, Kim et al disclose all the claimed limitations of claim 3.

In re page 14, applicant states that claims 11, 16-17, and 24 are dependent on claims 3, 12, and 19 and are therefore believed to be allowable for at least the reasons as set forth above with respect to the allowable of claims 3, 12, and 19.

In response, as discussed above with respect to claims 3, 12, and 19, Cuccia and Kim et al disclose all the claimed limitations of claims 3, 12, and 19.

In re page 14, applicant states that claims 18 and 25 are dependent on claims 12 and 19 and are therefore believed to be allowable for at least the reasons as set forth above with respect to the allowable of claims 12 and 19.

In response, as discussed above with respect to claims 12, and 19, Cuccia and Kim et al disclose all the claimed limitations of claims 12, and 19.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

Art Unit: 2614

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kim et al. (US Patent No. 6,405,372 B1).

In considering claim 1, Kim et al discloses all the claimed subject matter, note 1) the claimed receiving the program guide information and a program on the currently tuned in channel of the channels, and acquiring the program guide information for the received program received on the preferential channel is met by the 1<sup>st</sup> tuner 100 (Fig. 1, col. 2, lines 42-65), and the claimed comprising acquiring the remaining program guide information for the remaining accessible channels to acquire the remaining program guide information from other program guide information contained in the remaining accessible channels while the program being received on the currently tuned in channel is not displayed after a program guide mode is entered, wherein the remaining program guide information is acquired according to a prioritized channel search is met by the microprocessor 116 which is automatically checks sequentially, in step 202, other channels one by one through the second tuner 108, thereby receiving EPG information about each channel to update the old EPG information stored and the present invention can also provide a method for checking only the remaining channels for the EPG information except for the current viewing channel (Figs. 1 and 2, col. 2, line 66 to col. 4, line 47).



In considering claim 2, the claimed said acquiring the remaining program guide information for each channel including the channel currently tuned into and the channels except for the currently tuned in channel, comprises obtaining the program guide information of the accessible channels by a tuner while the program received by the tuner is not displayed is met by is met by the microprocessor 116 which is automatically checks sequentially, in step 202, other channels one by one through the second tuner 108, thereby receiving EPG information about each channel to update the old EPG information stored (Figs. 1 and 2, col. 2, line 66 to col. 4, line 47).

Claim 28 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 1.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 3, 5-10, 12-15, 19-23 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cuccia (US Patent No. 6,337,719 B1) in view of Kim et al. (US Patent No. 6,405,372 B1).

In considering claim 3, Cuccia discloses all claimed subject matter, note 1) the claimed acquiring program guide information of accessible channels, in response to the program guide command, wherein the program guide information is acquired according to a prioritized or preferential channel search is met by the micro processor 118 (Figs. 1, col. 3, line 55 to col. 4, line 63), 2) the claimed storing the acquired program guide

Art Unit: 2614

information is met by the digital memory 120 (Fig. 1, col. 3, line 55 to col. 4, line 63), 3) the claimed writing a program list on the basis of the stored program guide information is met by the digital memory 120 (Fig. 1, col. 3, line 55 to col. 4, line 63), 4) the claimed displaying the written program list to the user in response to the program guide command is met by the television screen 108 and the compound EPG (col. 3, lines 55-64 and col. 5, lines 58-65).

However, Cuccia explicitly does not disclose the limitations acquiring program guide information of accessible channels including a channel currently tuned into, a preferential channel, and remaining channels, being broadcast.

Kim et al teach that under such a state, the microprocessor 116 automatically checks sequentially, in step 202, other channels one by one through the second tuner 108, thereby receiving EPG information about each channel to update the old EPG information stored (Figs. 1 and 2, col. 2, line 66 to col. 4, line 47) and the present invention can also, it is possible that, when needed, only the channels desired by the user are checked for EPG information to be updated (col. 4, lines 24-47).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate automatically checked for EPG information using the second tuner as taught by Kim et al into Cuccia's system in order to provide a method for immediately updating the EPG information about all the channels of the digital TV set based on the latest correct EPG information.

In considering claim 5, the claimed further comprising determining whether the program guide information is effective by comparing a current time to an effective period

Art Unit: 2614

of stored program guide information and proceeding to said writing the program list when the stored program guide information is effective, before said acquiring the program guide information is met by the timer 119 or the flow chart of Fig. 2 (Figs. 1 and 2, col. 4, lines 36-55 and col. 5, lines 20-57) of Cuccia.

In considering claim 6, Cuccia discloses all claimed subject matter, note 1) the claimed writing and displaying a program list including the program guide information of channels tuned before a program guide command is executed from the stored program guide information is met by the television screen 108 and the compound EPG (col. 3, lines 55-64 and col. 5, lines 58-65), 2) the claimed acquiring the program guide information for each channel by searching for the accessible channels in a background operation while the program list is referred to is met by the tuner 103 which is free to scan the signals for the EPG information when the TV-set in stand-by mode (Fig. 1, col. 4, line 11 to col. 5, line 19) of Cuccia.

In considering claim 7, the claimed said acquiring the program guide information comprises determining the sequence of accessing channels by proximity of channels to the channel tuned before the program guide command is executed is met by the tuner 103 which is free to scan the signals for the EPG information when the TV-set in stand-by mode and the compound EPG (Fig. 1, col. 4, line 11 to col. 5, line 19 and col. 5, lines 58-65) of Cuccia.

In considering claim 8, the claimed said acquiring the program guide information comprises determining the order of priority of channels having the same proximity to the channel tuned before the program guide command is executed according to a channel

Art Unit: 2614

up/down command input before corresponding channels are accessed is met by the remote control unit 110 and the compound EPG (Fig. 1, col. 5, lines 1-65) of Cuccia.

In considering claim 9, the claimed wherein an upward or downward direction is preferential when no channel up/down command is executed is met by the tuner 103 which is free to scan the signals for the EPG information when the TV-set in stand-by mode and the compound EPG (Fig. 1, col. 4, line 11 to col. 5, line 19 and col. 5, lines 58-65) of Cuccia.

In considering claim 10, the claimed said acquiring the program guide information comprises searching channels upward or downward from the channel tuned before the program guide command is executed is met by the tuner 103 which is free to scan the signals for the EPG information when the TV-set in stand-by mode and the compound EPG (Fig. 1, col. 4, line 11 to col. 5, line 19 and col. 5, lines 58-65) of Cuccia.

Claim 12 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claims 3 and 6 and further the claimed rewriting a program list on the basis of the stored program guide information is met by the TV-set updates the EPG information (Fig. 1, col. 4, line 11 to col. 5, line 19 and col. 5, lines 58-65), 5) the claimed displaying the rewritten program list to a user is met by the television screen 108 and the compound EPG (col. 3, lines 55-64 and col. 5, lines 58-65) of Cuccia.

Claims 13-16 are rejected for the same reason as discussed in claims 7-10, respectively.

In considering claim 19, Cuccia discloses all claimed subject matter, note 1) the claimed a tuner tuning a currently tuned in channel is met by the tuner 103 which is free

Art Unit: 2614

to scan the signals for the EPG information when the TV-set in stand-by mode (Fig. 1, col. 4, line 11 to col. 5, line 19), 2) the claimed a program guide information detector detecting program guide information for the currently tuned in channel introduced via said tuner is met by the micro processor 118 (Fig. 1, col. 3, line 55 to col. 4, line 63), 3) the claimed a memory storing the program guide information for each channel detected by said program guide information detector is met by the digital memory 120 (Fig. 1, col. 3, line 55 to col. 4, line 63), 4) the claimed a key input introducing a user manipulation command such as a program guide command or a channel search command is met by the remote control unit 110 and the compound EPG (Fig. 1, col. 5, lines 1-65), 5) the claimed a microprocessor, in response to the manipulation command input via said key input, that writes a program list based on program guide information stored in said memory and searches for accessible channels by controlling said tuner in a background operation while a user refers to the program list is met by the micro processor 118 (Fig. 1, col. 3, line 55 to col. 5, line 19), 6) the claimed a character signal generator generating a character signal corresponding to the program list written by said microprocessor and providing the character signal to a screen is met by the television screen 108 and the compound EPG (col. 3, lines 55-64 and col. 5, lines 58-65).

However, Cuccia explicitly does not disclose the claimed a microprocessor searches for remaining accessible channels to obtain program guide information being broadcast for the remaining accessible channels by controlling said tuner in a background operation while a user refers to the program list.

Art Unit: 2614

Kim et al teach that under such a state, the microprocessor 116 automatically checks sequentially, in step 202, other channels one by one through the second tuner 108, thereby receiving EPG information about each channel to update the old EPG information stored (Figs. 1 and 2, col. 2, line 66 to col. 4, line 47) and the present invention can also, it is possible that, when needed, only the channels desired by the user are checked for EPG information to be updated (col. 4, lines 24-47).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate automatically checked for EPG information using the second tuner as taught by Kim et al into Cuccia's system in order to provide a method for immediately updating the EPG information about all the channels of the digital TV set based on the latest correct EPG information.

Claims 20-23 are rejected for the same reason as discussed in claims 7-10, respectively.

In considering claim 27, the claimed wherein said acquiring the program guide information comprises the step of determining the sequence of accessing channels by proximity of the channels to the channel tuned and by a channel up/down command input just before a channel search is determined is met by the tuner 103 which is free to scan the signals for the EPG information when the TV-set in stand-by mode and the compound EPG (Fig. 1, col. 4, line 11 to col. 5, line 19 and col. 5, lines 58-65) of Cuccia.

6. Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim et al. (US Patent No. 6,405,372 B1) in view of Cuccia (US Patent No. 6,337,719 B1).

In considering claim 26, Kim et al discloses all features of the instant invention as discussed in claim 1 above, except providing the claimed wherein the accessible channels include channels accessed by channels provided by a line input. Cuccia teaches that when the tuner it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate is not used, i.e., the TV set is in stand-by mode or the signal processor 104 is occupied with processing signals from the signal inputs 117 (Fig. 1, col. 4, lines 10-35). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the line input as taught by Cuccia into Kim et al's system in order to provide a receiving apparatus which provides the user with compound information, composed from information incorporated in multiple signals.

7. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cuccia (US Patent No. 6,337,719 B1) in view of Kim et al. (US Patent No. 6,405,372 B1).

In considering claim 4, the combination of Cuccia and Kim et al discloses all features of the instant invention as discussed in claim 3 above, except providing the claimed a message indicating that the user must wait until the program list is written. However, the capability of displaying message indicated the user must wait until the program is written is well known and old in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the combination of Cuccia and Kim et al's system with the well known message in order to increase the efficiency system operation in the combination of Cuccia and Kim et al.

8. Claims 11, 16-17, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cuccia (US Patent No. 6,337,719 B1) in view of Kim et al. (US Patent No. 6,405,372 B1) and further in view of Saitoh (US Patent 5,444,499).



In considering claim 11, the combination of Cuccia and Kim et al discloses all the features of the instant invention except for providing further comprising writing a probability distribution of tuned channels, wherein said acquiring the program guide information comprises searching the channels in an order of priority according to a probability distribution of channels. Saitoh teaches that the controller can calculate a probability that channels are to be selected, by accumulating a number of time which the channels are tuned (col. 5, lines 46-62) and searches for the channels in an order of priority according to a probability of tuning by the channels calculated (col. 6, lines 15-38). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the combination of Cuccia and Kim et al's system with the controller as taught in Saitoh in order to obtain the television guide without carrying out cumbersome tuning operations.

In consider claim 16, the claimed wherein said acquiring the guide information comprises searching channels upward or downward from the channel tuned before the program guide command is executed is met by the tuner 103 which is free to scan the signals for the EPG information when the TV-set in stand-by mode and the compound EPG (Fig. 1, col. 4, line 11 to col. 5, line 19 and col. 5, lines 58-65) of Cuccia.

In consider claim 17, the claimed further comprising writing a probability distribution of tuned channels, and wherein the channels are search for in order of priority according to the probability distribution of channels is met by the search of channels base on the priority disclosed in Saitoh, column 6, lines 15-38.

Claim 24 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 11.

9. Claims 18, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cuccia (US Patent No. 6,337,719 B1) in view of Kim et al. (US Patent No. 6,405,372 B1), and further in view of Mugura et al. (US Patent No. 6,243,142 B1).



In consider claim 18, the combination of Cuccia and Kim discloses all the limitations of the instant invention as discussed in claims 3 and 12 above, except for providing the claimed wherein said displaying the written program list comprises displaying a message indicating a status of program guide information in response to the program guide information of a corresponding channel not being stored. Mugura et al teach that the broadcast system generates at least one graphic image to indicate a status of these programs, the status including whether a user has selected pay-per-view broadcasts for purchase. The status also includes whether a broadcast system timer has been set to tune to a particular channel program at a designed time, whether a channel program has been set for recording, etc. (col. 2, lines 20-40). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the graphic image to indicate a status of programs as taught by Mugura et al into the combination of Cuccia and Kim et al's system in order to provide channel selection guides with many options regarding programs that are available for broadcast.

Claim 25 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 18.

***Conclusion***

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 2614


the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Trang U. Tran whose telephone number is (703) 305-0090. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM - 5:30 PM, Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John W. Miller can be reached on (703) 305-4795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

TT TT  
May 16, 2004

  
MICHAEL H. LEE  
PRIMARY EXAMINER